SOME NEW BOOKS.

Horace.

The third of the volumes on Roman Poets of the Republic and Augustan Age, planned by Prof. W. Y. SELLAR, is allotted to *Horace and the Elegiac Poets* (Macmillans). This is a posthumous work, and was left uncompleted at the author's death. Nevertheless, the chapters on Horace and four chapters on the elegiac poets, although they doubtless would have received some revisional touches, had the author lived, had been written out continuously for the printers. The pages devoted to Ovid, on the other hand, represent only notes made for chapters which were intended to be on the same scale as the others. These notes leave parts of the subject untouched, the biography of Ovid, for example, and his later poems. These shortcomings might have been made good to some extent by reprinting the essay on Ovid contributed by Mr. Sellar to the Encyclopædia Britannica. But, upon the whole, it was thought better to add nothing except the merely formal modifications needed to piece out or arrange some of the more fragmentary passages. In the present notice we shall pass over the elegiac poets and confine ourselves to two or three of the more striking features of that part of the book, comprising some 200 pages, in which the writings of Horace are discussed. In the six chapters devoted to this purpose, the Satires, Epistles, the Ars Poetica, the Epodes, and the Odes are separately examined, and their author, after the facts relating to his life have been set forth, is carefully considered in his several capacities of ironical observer, moralist, literary critic, and lyrical poet. It is the personal characteristics of Horace, as these may be gathered from his compositions, on which we shall chiefly dwell, premising, however, that, in his various works, we have pictures of himself, painted at different periods, inasmuch as his literary activity began in 41 B. C., when he was but 24 years old, and continued until he died, in the year 8 B. C., only a few weeks after the death of his friend, Mæcenas. There is, no doubt, a certain amount of apparent discrepancy between these pictures. It is hard to realize, for instance, that the author of some of the Epodes is the same man who wrote the first book of the Epistles. In trying to call up to ourselves his personal appearance, we must take into account not only his ironical self-depreciation—*semper derisor*, "always a mocker," was his own comment on himself—but the outward changes which time produced upon him. Thus when he speaks of himself at the age of 40 or 45 as *pinguem et nitidum, bene curata cute*, "fat and sleek, with skin well groomed," and as *corporis exigui, præcanum*, "of slender frame, and prematurely bald," and hints at his indolent and valetudinarian habits, we do not easily associate such a figure with the enthusiasm of a great lyrical poet, or with the wreaths of flowers which play so conspicuous a part in his convivial odes. We can correct this picture, however, by glimpses which he affords us of his appearance in youth, of "the black hair clustering round his narrow forehead" (a trait of beauty in a Roman, as their busts show that their foreheads were generally low and broad), and by the thought of the days when his "soft accents and sunny smile" were welcome at the banquet, and when it became him to "wear a toga of delicate texture," and to have his hair, after the fashion of the time, "glistening with unguents." We have to remember also that, if it was not in his graceful youth that he sang of love and wine, it was then, at least, that he lived the life which he was afterward to reproduce in his lyrical compositions. At the stage when it is possible to know him best—that is, in the maturity of his productive powers—he had lost, together with the grace and adventurous activity of youth, much, also, of its fire and passion; but he regarded the loss as well compensated by the philosophic mind which years had brought and by the consciousness of becoming *lenior et melior*, "a kindlier and better man." It is at this stage that one gains the best image of Horace, though it is possible to trace through all the previous stages how he came to be what he then was.

I.

Considered as a man, the intellectual quality which distinguished Horace above all his countrymen was his irony. We have already quoted the comment on himself, which he attributes to one of the speakers in his satires. This irony is as conspicuous in his judgments and statements about himself as about other people. He did not want to think himself, or to allow others to think him, better than, in his heart, he knew himself to be. The perfect and almost cynical frankness with which Horace reveals himself at once inspires confidence; and this confidence deepens into a strong conviction of the truth of his delineation of himself. If one has to qualify by subsequent reflection the immediate impression of his temper and character, derived from his writings, it is by making that impression more favorable to him. From the ethical point of view the most marked characteristic of the man was his self-dependence. He judged of things for himself, and refused to measure what was good or evil by the standards common among his countrymen. Again, while he thankfully enjoyed all outward advantages, his aim was to be independent of them for his happiness. He desired to regulate his life by reason, to introduce consistency into his desires and pursuits, to know what he really cared for, and to limit his efforts to attain them. To "live for himself"—that, is not to live in selfish isolation, but to be true to his own nature, to be what he was meant to be, and not to try to be or seem anything else—and to be independent of fortune. was the sum of his philosophy. This doctrine was not learned from the schools, but was gathered from reflection on the experience of life. Something he had learned from the teaching of his father, who, although of servile origin, seems to have been a worthy, sagacious, and pious man; something, also, from the example and precepts of such men as the sturdy and thrifty, yet genial, Italian yeoman, Ofellus. But the spirit of independence was inborn in him. It may be traced in the account he gives of his way of life in Rome and in the country. It may be seen, combined with the poetic impulse, in his love for lonely rambles among the hills and woods, such as he describes in the twenty-second ode of the first book and the thirty-fifth of the third. So far as Horace's choice of a mode of life was influenced by books, it is to the record which Lucilius had made of his own life in his Satires that Mr. Sellar would ascribe one at least of the forces which moulded the character of the younger poet. The attraction which the satirist of the republic had for the satirist of the Augustan age was personal as well as literary. There is a tone of sympathy with the man in the often-quoted lines, *Ille velut fidis arcana sodalibus olim credebat libris*, "He, in that elder time, used to confide his secrets to his writings, as one might to faithful boon companions." It is pointed out by Mr. Sellar that all which is known of Lucilius from ancient testimony and from the fragments of his writings—his self-criticism and his critical attitude toward the world around him, his intimacy with the best men of his time, his love of independence, his enjoyment of society, and the pleasure which he found in withdrawing himself into "some quiet haven," his contentment and love of simple fare, his freedom from all pedantry and asceticism—seems to be the very counterpart of what Horace was in his ordinary prosaic mood. When Horace says that he would not exchange his independent ease for all the wealth of Arabia, he writes in the spirit, almost the tone, of Lucilius. Horace, indeed, had none of the "fierce indignation" of the elder satirist, which reappeared, long afterward, under different circumstances, in Juvenal. Nor had Lucilius any of the *ingenî benigna vena*, "Talent's kindlier vein," which was the chief endowment of Horace. But in their ordinary tastes and habits there seems to have been a real affinity between the friend of Mæcenas and the friend of Scipio and Lælius.

II.

As a matter of course, his resolute spirit of self-dependence would influence the relations of Horace to others and determine his deepest convictions. We see him maintain the attitude in presence of both Mæcenas and Augustus, though ungrudging in the expression of his gratitude to the former and of his loyal admiration for the latter. His spirit of self-respect and self-possession enabled him to live on an intimate footing with many distinguished contemporaries without being absorbed by any of them. To the same self-poise should be attributed the fact that, while confessing in a vein of humorous exaggeration to innumerable follies, arising from a love of pleasure, in the earlier part of his career, he never, as Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius did, allows his happiness and peace of mind to be at the mercy of any one, whether man or woman. So, likewise, in his attitude toward the leaders of the philosophical school, he does not, like Lucretius, give way to an excess of hero worship, but acknowledges allegiance to no school or master. He judges them all candidly, and confines himself to taking from them all what he finds true in his own experience. The only philosophical teacher by whom he seems personally attracted is the Cyrenaic Aristippus. In him Horace seems to recognize the same detachment from alien influences which he recognized in Lucilius, and which he cultivated in himself. Again, in his art, while knowing how to turn to the best account the masterpieces of Greek lyrical poetry, he proclaims his own reliance on himself; *Qui sibi fidit dux regit examen*. "He who has faith in himself rules the swarm as a leader." His success in art was due to the union of absolute trust in his own powers with perfect knowledge of their limitations. The same spirit manifested itself in his contemplation of the ultimate mysteries of human life. He is as free as Lucretius from the superstitions which disturbed the peace of many of his contemporaries. It is true that Horace seems half to believe in a power, uncontrollable by man, which determines the destinies of individuals; a power to which he gives the various names of Fortune, God, Jove, a power which gives and takes away the blessings of life, according to its own will or caprice, regarded in different moods as a righteous will or a mocking caprice. But, even of this power, he claims to be independent, not, indeed, for external goods, but for his happiness; *Sed satis est orare Jovem quae donat et aufert; Det vitam, det opes, æquum mi animum ipse parabo*, "Let it suffice to pray to Jove for what he gives and takes away; let him give life, let him give wealth, my gift to myself shall be a steadfast soul." In the midst of all his contentment with his lot he never forgets the inevitable end. But he seeks no comfort outside himself. He does not, like Virgil, meet the thought of death, "the thought of inexhaustible melancholy," with the vague hope of a spiritual life hereafter. He accepts the thought of death with a recognition calmer, if less lofty than that of Lucretius. Like Montaigne, he seems to feel that the way to "fight death" is to "disarm him of his novelty and strangeness, to converse and be familiar with him," and that the "premeditation of death is the premeditation of liberty." He draws from this premeditation the lesson rightly to use and wisely to enjoy that which alone is at a man's command, the present hour.

III.

The author of these essays would regard this self-dependent attitude as the central quality in the character of Horace and the chief source of his intellectual and moral power. It is, at the same time, pointed out that this, after all, explains only one side of his nature. No writer of whom we know so much through his own work seems to have combined in the same degree the capacity of being happy alone with aptitude for social life and keen enjoyment of it. While the first characteristic was the condition of his inspiration, of his meditative habit and of his literary excellence, to the second he owed many of the materials of his art, and also the sanity of his genius, the moderation and truth of his judgment, and his immunity from the weaknesses and extravagance of the literary temperament. His relations to society were determined by reflection as much as by impulse. In his lonely musings he considered not only how he could be true to himself, but how he should be *dulcis amicis*, "agreeable to his friends." His early admission into a social circle inheriting the traditions of a governing aristocracy—although the son of a freedman, he was a military tribune at Philippi before he was 24 years old—implies the possession of some great social charm; and the nature of that charm is indicated not only in the humor and gayety of many of his writings, but in the manifold proofs, given in his Odes and Epistles, of appreciation and consideration for others, and in the evidence which all his writings afford of tact and good sense, of freedom from vanity and self-assertion. His satire, indeed, made enemies, and he was feared and disliked by those who felt themselves to be exposed to it. But even the exercise of this faculty was restrained in him by a high sense of honor. There is no charge which he repels with more grave earnestness than that of taking pleasure in hurting the feelings of others. There is no character which he describes with such concentrated scorn as that of the slanderer and backbiter. Among the breaches of honor which he most strongly condemns is the betrayal of a secret, and among the qualities to which he assigns the highest praise is faithful silence. He professes to use his satiric "stilus" only in self-defence, or against the enemies and nuisances of society. There is no doctrine which he preaches with more sense and good feeling than he does that of charitable indulgence to the faults of our friends. If it is safe to infer what his conduct was from that which he fervently approved, the conclusion would be that Horace's relations with all those with whom he lived on terms of intimacy—and they included all who were best worth knowing in Roman society—were regulated like those of the best men in our own day, by a high sense of honor, a tolerant temper and a kind heart. Traces of the same temper may be found in his relations to slaves and social inferiors, as in the liberties which he allowed Davus to take with him, in the indulgence which he shows to his overseer, his sympathy with the *rustica Phidyle*, who may have been his *villica*, or farm servant, and the kindly appreciation which he expresses for his country neighbors. Yet, while Horace was a true friend, not even Mr. Sellar, to whom he is intensely sympathetic, professes to recognize in him the impulsively affectionate nature which is the great attraction of Catullus. There is a certain degree, not, indeed, of the coldness observed in his love affairs, but of reserve, in his every expression of feeling, except toward one or two persons, notably Mæcenas and Virgil. He is more ready to sympathize with the signs of warm affection bestowed on others than to claim them for himself. Thus, for instance, the ode on the return of Plotius Numida from Spain naturally suggests a comparison with that of Catullus on the return of Verannius. But, while Catullus thinks of his own joy in greeting his friend with the most unrestrained demonstrations of affection—*adplicansque collum, jucundum os oculosque suaviabor*, "Winding my arms about thy neck, I will kiss thy dear mouth and eyes"—Horace pictures to himself those proofs of affection as bestowed on Ælius Lamia, a dearer friend and a younger man than himself; *Caris multa sodalibus, nulli plura tamen dividit oscula quam dulci Lamiæ*, "To his dear companions he awards many a kiss, yet to none more than to delightful Lamia." So, too, in his sorrow for the loss of Quintilius, he thinks more of the pain which it will cause to Virgil than of his own pain; *Multis ille bonis flebilis occidit, nulli flebilior quam tibi, Virgili*. "He dies by many good men wept, but wept by none more than by thee, my Virgil." Such expressions Mr. Sellar, would explain partly by Horace's dislike to make any parade of his deepest feelings, but partly also by the spirit of renunciation which the poet showed in regard to worldly honors, to wealth, and to life itself. As he held that most was to be got out of life by not valuing it too much, and most enjoyment from worldly goods by not calculating too absolutely on their permanence—*Quanto quisque sibi plura negaverit, a dis plura feret*, "The more any one shall have denied himself, so much the more shall he gain from the gods"—so, even to the higher blessing of affection, Horace did not abandon himself too unreservedly. He cultivated moderation, *mediocritas*, in feeling, just as he desired the golden mean, or *aurea mediocritas*, of station.

IV.

A further point to be noted is that, while Horace seems to attach more importance to the practical duties and the right management of life than to literary fame, yet he undoubtedly regarded literature as the serious business of his life. The proudest feeling of his being expresses itself in the confident claim to immortality which he makes for his lyrical poetry. Of his satires and epistles, which have met with nearly as much favor in modern times, he speaks almost slightingly as undeserving of the title of poetry, and as likely to be popular in Rome only so long as they are new—*Carus eris Romæ donec te deseret ætas*, "Thou shalt be liked at Rome till the lapse of time shall make thee stale." Yet, even in those works which he seems to regard as intended merely for the current age, and which seem to be the result of such easy workmanship, Horace aims at correcting, both by precept and example, the fashion of careless composition which had come down from ruder times.

Horace undoubtedly felt, however, that the great work of his life was to discover and make perfect the vehicle of expression for that vein of lyrical inspiration, *spiritum Graiae tenuem Camenae*, "the delicate spirit of the Grecian muse," the first trace of which he finds in the poetic fancies of his childhood, and of which he must have become more fully conscious through the sympathetic study of the early Greek lyric poets. But a gift so exquisite and rare could not be perfected, could, indeed, hardly be kept alive amid the bustle, distraction, and pleasures of Rome. By a man of Horace's social temperament, the career of a lyrical poet could only be followed apart from the crowd and amid the peace and beauty of nature; *me gelidum nemus Nympharumque leves cum Satyris chori secernunt populo*, "The cool grove and the light-footed choirs of nymphs dancing with satyrs draw me away from the crowd." It is to the "streams among the orchards of Tiber and the thick foliage of the grove" that he attributes "his distinction in Æolian song." It is around "the groves and river banks of Tiber" that, "like the Matine bee sipping the sweets of the wild thyme," he, with unremitting toil and joy, moulded his thoughts and experience into form and melody. It is in the same place, or among the Sabine highlands, or in the cool mountain air of Praeneste, or beneath the clear skies of Baiae that he is most conscious of his inspiration; *Vester, Camenae, vester in arduous tollor Sabinos*, "It is when I am borne along the Sabine heights that I am yours, ye Muses, wholly yours." That love of nature which is one of the greatest charms in Horace's lyrical art may be said to be the condition of its existence.

Two other points remain to be marked by Prof. Sellar among the poet's personal characteristics, as these are clearly deducible from his writings. The first is the measure of his taste for pictorial, plastic, and glyptic art. The Augustan age and the age preceding it were times in which the Roman mind became eminently susceptible to the beauty of art in the various forms of architecture, sculpture, pictures, gems, cups, and furniture. The desire to possess the most precious works of art became a strong passion among the richer classes, and the affectation of connoisseurship was apparently as common as in modern times. Horace hits at these weaknesses in his Satires, and even professes indifference to the possession of such objects of desire, and boasts of his own contentment with the plain furniture, the "*munda supellex*" which suited his means. We are reminded, however, by Prof. Sellar that we need not, in the case of Horace, any more than in the case of Cicero, who equally condemns the extravagant devotion to art, yet whose early letters to Atticus attest his anxiety to adorn his villas with the works of Greek artists, take these professions of Philistine obtuseness as indicative of any insensibility to the refining influence of the pleasures of the eye. In the license which the poet allows to Davus in the seventh satire of the second book he seems to admit the enjoyment which he derived from the pictures of Pausias, who was famous for the minute perfection and delicacy of his workmanship. There are passages, also, in his Odes and Epistles which show appreciation of such delights, though he will not permit them to disturb the balance of his mind nor acknowledge that they have an equal claim with the work of the poet to perpetuate the great qualities of men. It is, however, the form and workmanship of his Odes which bear the most conclusive, though indirect, testimony to the power which art had over his taste and imagination. The mythology of his Odes seems in many cases to be transferred from the figures on groups of the sculptor or painter, and especially from engravings on gems, which probably had the same attraction for him as the minute art of Pausias. The finished form and delicate workmanship, and the clear, sharp impressions of the Odes show a power of representation akin to that of those nameless artists whose works have come down to us. The power of musical sound, moreover, equally with the power of artistic form, has passed into his works, and it is in their song and music that he finds the chief charm of Tyndaris and Phyllis when he invites those ladies to his Sabine farm.

V.

It is, finally, in his love of books that Prof. Sellar considers Horace a type of the finest culture of his own or any other age. If the Augustan poet seems to undervalue the older national literature, this is, we are reminded, because he was almost alone in fighting the cause of his contemporaries, Virgil, Varius, and the rest, against the critics who disparaged the present age as compared with the past. He evinces, nevertheless, a true appreciation of the merits, as well as of the faults, of Ennius and other writers of an elder time, and his satires, and even his odes, show how deeply he was imbued with the style and sentiment of Terence, as well as of Terence's master, Menander. If he does not name Lucretius or Cicero, he reveals that he was a student of their philosophy and their diction; and, notwithstanding his slight and apparently disparaging mention of Catullus, he discloses his appreciation of him by not infrequent imitations of his language and tone. It is, however, the love of Greek literature that especially distinguishes him. In poetry, alone among his contemporaries, Horace disregards the Alexandrians and goes back to the oldest and purest sources, the *integri fontes*, "untainted springs," namely, Homer, Archilochus, and the whole range of Greek lyrical poets from Alcæus and Sappho to Pindar and Simonides. As a satirist, he was a student of the authors of the old as well as of the later Greek comedy, of Eupolis, as well as of Menander. In his studies of moral philosophy, also, he seems to have gone back to the older writers, and professes to be a disciple of Aristippus rather than of Epicurus. It is Chrysippus and Crantor rather than more recent representatives of their views who are quoted as the authorities on the philosophy of the Porch and the Academy. As a critic, on the other hand, he seems to have attached himself to the Alexandrians, who were in that department as strong as they were weak in the province of creative literature.

Apart altogether, therefore, from the artistic charm of his works and their power of bringing back the life, and mind, and spirit of a great age in the history and development of civilization, the study of Horace brings before us a personality of great human interest which we can know as intimately as we can that of any man of letters of recent times. The study also brings before us, as has been said, a representative of the best and purest literary and artistic culture. It would be to run counter to the spirit in which he appeals to us to make him out more perfect or more earnest in character than he has depicted himself. But, after all allowances are made for the love of pleasure and for the love of the great world which he does not profess to conceal, for some measure of failure in the highest enthusiasm, and for obvious limitations, both in genius and spiritual life, we, nevertheless, feel that there is hardly any writer of any period of whom we seem to be able to make so familiar a friend, from whom we can learn so much in knowledge of the world, in manners, in culture, in good sense, in consideration for others, without feeling him too far removed from the sphere of our ordinary life and associations.

The Federal Constitution in Massachusetts.

About all that is generally known concerning the reception of the Federal Constitution in Massachusetts is derived from the proceedings of the State Convention, as these are set forth in "Elliot's Debates," and from the comments thereon in Bancroft's "History of the Formation of the Constitution." There are other sources of information in contemporary documents, and it is high time that these should be turned to account. This has now been done by SAMUEL BANNISTER HARDING, Assistant Professor of History in the Indiana University, the outcome of whose investigations is published in a volume entitled *The Contest Over the Ratification of the Federal Constitution in the State of Massachusetts* (Longmans, Green & Co.). The author undertook the work while he was connected with the Seminary of American history and institutions in Harvard University during the years 1893-95, and he was impelled to the inquiry, he tells us, by a belief that only through a more thorough study, than had been hitherto made, of the internal political history of the States, during the Revolutionary War and in the period immediately following it, could a right understanding be obtained of the subsequent party struggle in national politics, by which the interpretation of the Constitution was fixed and the scope and general policy of the new Government were determined. The materials used in the preparation of this essay are grouped under the following heads, namely, manuscripts in the archives of Massachusetts, contemporary pamphlets and newspapers, the published correspondence of men of the time, and the reports of the debates of the ratifying Convention. The report reprinted in "Elliot's Debates" was based on notes taken chiefly by Benjamin Russell of the *Massachusetts Centinel*, and was first published in that paper. The best edition of the "Massachusetts Debates" was issued in 1856, under the authorization of the Legislature; here we have not only the debates as reported by Russell, but also brief notes taken by Theophilus Parsons, which are often of considerable value in supplementing and correcting the former; the journal of the Convention is also included, together with petitions from several towns concerning contested elections and the actions of committees thereon. We add that minutes of the proceedings of the Convention were also kept by Jeremy Belknap; these were published in 1858, and, though brief, are often useful.

I.

In an introductory chapter, Mr. Harding points out that by 1787 there had arisen in Massachusetts a pronounced antagonism in political matters between the upper and the lower classes. By this antagonism which, next to the confidence of the masses in their ability to pass upon all questions of government, was the great characteristic of the period, is meant something more than the latent hostility born of envy, which frequently exists on the part of those who have not a competence toward those who have. This undoubtedly was an element in its composition, but not the sole or the most important one. Economic and political influences of far greater weight entered into it, and it was chiefly owing to these that by the year 1787 the antagonism of classes had developed into an earnest if not a bitter contest between the forces of aristocracy and democracy for the control of the State Government. In the development of this contest, it was the democracy that had taken the initiative. The distrust of the upper classes was partly a natural consequence of the growth of the democratic spirit which accompanied the Revolution, but partly, also, it was the outcome of special causes. One of these causes is discernible in the fact that so many of the professional men and men of property and education had either remained loyalists or given but a lukewarm support to the measures of the patriot party; another cause was the natural antagonism of interest between town and country, between agricultural and commercial sections; still a third is to be found in the economic and legal conditions of the times, which, after the conclusion of peace, speedily brought into wide disrepute one of the most conspicuous elements of the aristocracy, namely, the legal profession. It was the antagonism between town and country, accentuated after the war by the contrast between the poverty of the farming regions and the comparative luxury of the maritime towns, that made the removal of the capital from Boston a capital article of the platforms put forward by the leaders of Shays's Rebellion, and that helped to break down the popular prejudice against impost and excise taxes, this, in turn, leading to the attempt to throw the burden of taxation on commerce. In 1786-87 opposition to the "overbearing power of oppressive lawyers" had become even more widespread than the desire for the removal of the capital. There was much legitimate ground for dissatisfaction with the administration of the law as it was conducted at this time. Fees of all sorts were high, and imprisonment for debt was not only allowed, but was of frequent occurrence. The form taken by the movement for relief was two-fold: First, to abolish "the pernicious practice of the law," allowing each citizen to "support and defend his cause before any court of law, with the same freedom as before arbitrators," and, secondly, to exclude lawyers from all offices within the gift of the people.

The result of the growing distrust of the upper classes was to be seen in the change in the character of the men who, after the Revolution, were intrusted with office. This was remarked by John Adams, upon his return in 1788 from his nine-year residence abroad. "The constancy of the people in a course of annual elections," he writes, "has discarded from their confidence almost all the old stanch, firm patriots who conducted the revolution in all the civil departments, and has called to the helm pilots much more selfish and much less skilful." The revolt which broke out in the Western counties in 1786-87 under Daniel Shays, and which was designed to coerce the Government into granting the demands of the popular leaders, seems to have been the last straw which broke the back of the aristocracy and goaded it into reprisals. It was this which crystallized the existing class hostility into definite political opposition. A writer signing himself "Atticus" in the *Independent Chronicle* of Boston for Oct. 18, 1787, undertakes to assign the very moment at which this crystallization took place. From the countermanding of the order for the troops to go to Concord to support the Court of Common Pleas in September, 1787, two parties, he said, had arisen in the State: First, "that of the populace," which tended to "general levelism and democratic turbulence;" secondly, that of the rich, of men of "austere political principles," which tended to "an alteration of the Constitution of our State and the subjection of the people to a rigid aristocracy." The reason why these parties arose just at that time, according to this writer, was that the populace thought that the moment had come when they could shake off their obligations to the rich without punishment, while the rich judged from the countermanding of the order to the troops that the existing laws were no longer sufficient for the protection of their interests. The attitude which seems to have been taken generally by men of education and property at this time is indicated by a letter from Theodore Sedgwick to Rufus King. "Every man of observation," writes Sedgwick, "is convinced that the end of Government security cannot be attained by the exercise of principles founded on democratic equality. A war is now actually levied on the virtue, property and distinctions in the community, and, however there may be an appearance of a temporary cessation of hostilities, yet the flame will again and again break out." Henry Knox, who had been a hatter, but was now a Major-General and an aristocrat, took even a more downright view of the matter. "The democracy," he wrote to King, who was then attending the Federal Convention at Philadelphia, "might be managed, nay, it would remedy itself, after being sufficiently fermented; but the vile State Governments are sources of pollution which will contaminate the American name, perhaps for ages. Machines that must produce ill, but cannot produce good; smite them in the name of God and the people." Another illustration of the views of the aristocratic faction is cited by Mr. Harding from a pamphlet "by a native of Boston" (Jonathan Jackson), published at Worcester in 1788. In this the author, after commenting on the fact that "much has been lately said of aristocratical men and principles," and that great alarms have been founded thereon, asserts that the greatest risk of the people is "their proneness to a highly democratical government, a government in which they would be directed by no rule but their own will and caprice, or the interested wishes of a very few persons, who *affect* to speak the sentiments of the people." "The people in any numbers," he says in another place, "cannot even be trusted to appoint those who shall manage for them, they are so liable, when together in large numbers, to be acted upon and cajoled by those who, in every community, are upon the watch to deceive, and active to gain authority to themselves for sinister views." Hence, he proposes a scheme for political action through a complicated system of intermediate electors. On the other hand, such ultra-aristocratic views reacted to strengthen democratic tendencies in many who did not sympathize with the projects for debt repudiation which were advocated by the popular party. Thus an extremely intelligent woman, the author of a history of the American Revolution, Mrs. Mercy Warren, wife of James Warren of Plymouth, Speaker of the Massachusetts House of Representatives in 1787-88, a woman whose affiliations through her husband and his friends were with the democratic faction, saw in Shays's revolt only "discontents artificially wrought up by men who wish for a more strong and splendid Government." To the same effect is a communication in the Boston *Independent Chronicle*, under date of Oct. 4, 1787: "A number of men who have pretended to be disgusted at the late unhappy commotion," asserts the writer, "secretly rejoice at the opportunity of establishing, under pretence of necessity, a tyrannical rule, in the room of our free and happy (State) Constitution. A certain mark by which these are distinguished is their repeated declaration that the people have not virtue enough to bear a free Government when, in fact, nothing has taken place here but what has happened in every form of government yet established in the world." Thus, by the close of 1787, we find in Massachusetts a democracy incensed at what it considers the oppressions, actual and prospective, of the aristocracy, fairly united in its plans of political action, and abundantly confident of its power to decide all political matters whatsoever, unaided by the advice of the upper classes. The aristocratic element in the State had looked to the Convention at Philadelphia for such a Federal Constitution as would enable it to maintain that ascendancy in matters of government which had of old been the lot of men of wealth and education, but which of late had been seriously threatened by the encroachments of the jealous democracy. Though it did not get all that was desired at the hands of the Convention, the Massachusetts aristocracy found the new Constitution, in the main, acceptable. Just in proportion, however, as it was welcomed by the upper classes, it promised to prove unacceptable to the populace. Under the influence of the existing antagonism of social elements, whatever met with the favor of the aristocracy came shortly to be regarded with suspicion by the democracy; and, in the contest which ensued for ratification, the dread of fastening irretrievably upon themselves the power of the aristocracy, unquestionably formed the chief factor in determining the greater portion of the inhabitants of the State, especially those of the rural districts, to oppose resolutely the adoption of the new system.

II.

A copy of the Federal Constitution was received at Boston on Sept. 25, 1787, and was published the next day in an extra of the *Massachusetts Centinel*. Within ten days thereafter it had appeared in all the papers of the State, and various pamphlet editions were soon offered for sale. Thus, in the course of a few weeks, the new plan of Federal Government was made accessible to all the reading citizens of the State, and speedily became the chief subject of public and private discussion. The first impression was generally favorable. Knox wrote on Oct. 3, "The people of Boston are enraptured with it as it is, but would have liked it still better had it been higher toned;" on the 7th, Cristopher Gore reported: "The Federal plan is well esteemed, and the adoption will be easy." About the same time James Sullivan wrote: "I flatter myself it will meet with no opposition in this State." The apparent preponderance of sentiment at first in favor of the Constitution is partly ascribed by Mr. Harding to the fact that the advocates of the plan came forward more promptly than its opponents. It was not long, however, before such extravagant expectations as those entertained by Sullivan were removed. In the contest which ensued Elbridge Gerry, although he had been one of the dissentients in the Philadelphia Convention, seems, in the main, to have kept in the background; but, owing to his participation in that body, considerable weight attached to his objections to the Constitution published in letters and a pamphlet, and summarized in a report to the Massachusetts General Court, a report which he is said to have composed in New York, in concert with Richard Henry Lee, the arch-enemy of the proposed system, and which the advocates of the Constitution admit did considerable harm to their cause. The first assault upon the Constitution printed in Massachusetts seems to have been that which was made in the *Massachusetts Gazette* of Oct. 9. 1787, but, with each successive issue of the press thereafter, the number of anti-Federalist pieces increased. In the main the original articles were the work of a comparatively few men living in or near Boston; these were then copied in the papers of the interior, and, with articles clipped from papers outside the State, formed the bulk of the anti-Federalist literature. It is difficult to identify the authors, but, in Mr. Harding's opinion, various indications justify the belief that James Warren, Benjamin Austin, James Winthrop, and Samuel Adams were the chief persons concerned. It is acknowledged by the author of this essay that, in general, the articles evince good temper, literary ability, and a fair amount of candor. The people dwelling in the interior of the State, though they were mainly hostile to the new plan of Federal Government, seem to have made only two contributions of considerable length to the literature directed against the new system.

One of these, signed "Cornelius," appeared in the *Hampshire Chronicle* of Dec. 11 and 18, 1787, and is given in an appendix to this book. Mr. Harding does it but justice when he describes it as a fair-minded production. Still higher praise must be given to the letters published in the *Massachusetts Centinel*, under the signature of "A Republican Federalist," and attributed to James Warren. The author of these letters contended that the proposed Constitution violated the instructions given to the delegates sent by Massachusetts to the Philadelphia Convention, and was also a subversion, not only of the compact contained in the Articles of Confederation, but of the State Constitution of Massachusetts. It is certain that the Massachusetts Legislature in both of its resolves on the subject authorized its delegates to take part in the Philadelphia Convention solely for the purpose of revising the Articles of Confederation, and of reporting to Congress and the several legislatures such alterations and provisions as should, when agreed to in Congress and confirmed by the State, render the Federal Constitution adequate to the exigencies of government. It is also certain that the Articles of Confederation themselves provided that they should be perpetual, and that no alteration should be made in them at any time, unless such alteration should have been agreed to by the Congress of the United States, and have been afterward confirmed by the legislature of every State. It is no less certain that the State Constitution of Massachusetts, adopted in 1780, which would be superseded by the Federal Constitution whenever the two instruments were irreconcilable, could only be amended, provided two-thirds of the qualified voters pronounced, at a special election, in favor of a revision, whereupon they were subsequently invited to elect delegates for the purpose. So far, then, as the proposed Federal Constitution superseded the State Constitution of Massachusetts, a ratification of it simply by a State Convention could not be binding on the citizens of the State, being directly repugnant to an existing covenant. There were, in fine, so it was asserted by the author of these letters, but two safe courses for the coming State Convention to pursue. One was to adjourn until the position of Virginia, the second great leader of American public opinion, should be known; the other was to return the proceedings of the Federal Convention to the Legislature, to be thence remitted to Congress, there to be amended and resubmitted to the States in a manner agreeable to the provisions of the Articles of Confederation. The acceptance of the Constitution as it stood, the "Republican Federalist" claimed, would be, we repeat, a dissolution of the government of Massachusetts, a violation of the compact contained in the State Constitution, and hence, could not be binding on the citizens of the State. It is conceded by Mr. Harding that the argument set forth in these letters is able and ingenious, and at times, unanswerable on strictly constitutional grounds. Two other letters contributed to the *Centinel* under the signature of "Hampden," in whom the author of this book is inclined to recognize James Sullivan, proposed a series of amendments to the new plan of Federal government and advised that the State Convention should ratify only on condition that the new Congress should, at the very outset, in joint session, voting by States, take into consideration the amendments proposed by the State Conventions, those in which any seven States agreed, to be forthwith incorporated into the Constitution. Should there be none in which seven States agreed, then the Constitution should remain as it was.

III.

After a sharp contest in the Legislature, where a motion was made to submit the Federal Constitution to the people in their town meetings, which undoubtedly would have rejected it by an overwhelming vote, a State Convention was called and the towns were invited to send delegates. In spite of the vital importance of the question at issue, it appears from the journal of the Convention that out of a total of some 318 towns entitled to send delegates 46 refused or failed to do so. Of the delinquents, 31 were in the District of Maine, and were, for the most part, the more recently incorporated townships, where the pressure of debt and the struggle with the wilderness limited political interest chiefly to the election of a Sheriff. Four of the remaining fifteen were on the Cape, where the prevailing interests were almost equally removed from the general current of politics. Notwithstanding the remissness of forty-six towns, the Convention that assembled at Boston, Jan. 9, 1788, was the largest called in any State to pass upon the Federal Constitution, the names of 364 delegates being returned to it, 355 of whom were present when the final vote was taken. According to the minutes of the proceedings kept by Jeremy Belknap, it was the most complete representation that ever was made of the State of Massachusetts. On the Federalist side, the leaders were men of ability and established reputation, such as Nathaniel Gorham, Caleb Strong, and Rufus King, all of whom had sat in the Philadelpha Convention; ex-Gov. Bowdoin, Gen. Heath, Gen. Lincoln, and the rising statesmen, Theodore Sedgwick, Theophilus Parsons, and Fisher Ames. Of those openly in opposition, there was scarcely a member who could be compared with these. Dr. Samuel Holten of Danvers, who, with Gerry and King, had, in 1785, refused to present the resolve of the Massachusetts Legislature recommending a Federal Convention, was almost the only exception, and he was present only a portion of the time. The position which Gov. Hancock would eventually take was uncertain. The old patriot, Samuel Adams, of whose secret opposition there can now be no doubt, was induced by various considerations, including conspicuously a demonstration by the Boston mechanics, to refrain from openly assailing the proposed Federal system. Oliver Phelps, who had served in the Commissary Department during the war, and had grown rich as a merchant in Berkshire county, had been elected to the Convention; but, becoming convinced, apparently, that opposition would be unsuccessful and unpopular, he had resigned his seat before the Convention met. Nathan Dane, who, with Richard Henry Lee, had taken the lead in Congress in the attempt to amend the Constitution before submitting it to the States, was mortified on his return to Massachusetts to find all whom he had respected in favor of the new system; he had, therefore, held his peace. Elbridge Gerry, seemingly, had not been a candidate. Cambridge, where he lived, was so strongly prejudiced that an election seemed to him hopeless. When the Convention assembled, however, on the motion of the opponents of the Constitution, a motion which the friends of the new system dared not oppose, he was invited to take a place on the floor to answer such questions as might be put to him, but within a few days trouble arose because, unasked, he offered certain information; a wrangle ensued which, for a time, threatened very serious consequences, and, thenceforth, Gerry stayed away from the Convention. Who, then, were the anti-Federalist leaders in the debate? A half dozen obscure men whose names are unknown, even to most students of this period. William Widgerly of New Gloucester, Me., was one of these, Samuel Thompson of Topsham, Me., was another. A third determined enemy of the proposed Constitution was Samuel Nasson or Nason of Sanford, Me. From Massachusetts proper Dr. John Taylor of Douglas, Worcester county, was the most conspicuous of the anti-Federalists. Another delegate from this part of the State who was active in opposition was Capt. Phanuel Bishop of Rehoboth, Bristol county. Belknap styles him "a noted insurgent," and he seems to have ridden into office on the crest of the Shaysite wave. To the foregoing list of anti-Federalist leaders might be added the name of Charles Turner of Scituate, Plymouth county, who, during the first few days of the convention, was the ablest and most dignified, as well as one of the most sincere opponents of the new plan of Government. Soon after the opening of the session, however, he was seized with an illness which confined him to his bed, thus removing him from the scene of action at a critical conjuncture; furthermore, his influence was ultimately exerted and his vote cast in favor of the Constitution.

IV.

The evidence collected by Mr. Harding renders it certain that, had a vote been taken as soon as the Convention assembled, it would have been overwhelmingly against the proposed Federal Government. Alive to their weakness, the Federalist leaders were wise enough to adopt a conciliatory policy which made their ultimate triumph possible. This policy led some of their opponents at least to give them a candid hearing, and, that hearing once obtained, the superior eloquence of the Federalists, coupled with the famous "conciliatory proposition" introduced by Gov. Hancock, ultimately secured enough converts to change the balance of opinion and produce a majority in favor of ratification. It is well known that Hancock's proposition was that the Convention should ratify the Federal Constitution unconditionally, but that the ratification should be accompanied with an earnest recommendation that the proper steps should be immediately taken to add nine specified amendments to the original text. When the motion to ratify was finally put, it was carried by the close vote of 187 to 168. It will be seen that the majority was only 19. Nine delegates whose names had been returned to the Convention, but who were not present when the vote was taken, might have reduced the majority to ten. Bearing in mind that it was mainly the anti-Federalist towns that were unrepresented, Mr. Harding thinks it may be safely asserted that, out of the forty-six delinquent corporations, there were enough which were anti-Federalist to have procured the rejection of the Constitution. The geographical distribution of the vote is interesting. From the four coast counties, Suffolk, Essex, Plymouth, and Barnstable, heavy majorities in favor of the Constitution were cast in each instance, the total vote from the four being 100 yeas to 19 nays. Of the five counties, Middlesex, Bristol, Worcester, Hampshire, and Berkshire, the reverse is true. From these counties strong majorities against the Constitution were cast, the total being 60 yeas to 129 nays. The vote from the three Maine counties, York, Cumberland, and Lincoln, was more evenly balanced, the yeas numbering 25, the nays 21. The outlying county of Dukes cast its two votes in favor of the Constitution; so, too, the Cape Cod district, so far as it was represented, went solidly for the Constitution, with the exception of the one town of Sandwich. With regard to the results, John Avery, Jr., wrote, under date of Feb. 13, 1788, to George Thatcher, a delegate in Congress, that he was "pleased, upon reflection," that the adoption was by so slender a majority; first, because it would avert much groundless jealousy "in the minds of our Southern brethren;" if Massachusetts had been more united it might have been said that her citizens expected greater advantages from the "carrying trade;" and, secondly, because "the slenderness of the majority would convince Congress of the necessity of agreeing to the proposed amendment."

Were improper influences used to secure the adoption of the Constitution by the Massachusetts Convention? Mr. Harding says that he would not consider this unpleasant question, were it not for two circumstances. The first of these is the publication by a Boston paper during the session of the Convention of a direct charge that an attempt was being made to bribe Anti-Federalist members of that body. The text of this charge is as follows: "The most diabolical plan is on foot to corrupt the members of the Convention who oppose the adoption of the new Constitution. Large sums of money have been brought from a neighboring State for that purpose, contributed by the wealthy. If so, is it not probable there may be collections for the same accursed purpose nearer home?" The second circumstance referred to is the assertion by a reputable historical writer within the last twenty years, Henry B. Dawson, editor of the old *Historical Magazine*, that "it is very well known—indeed, the son and biographer of one of the great leaders of the Constitutionalists in New York has frankly admitted to us—that enough members of the Massachusetts Convention were bought with money from New York to secure the ratification of the new system by Massachusetts." An examination of such evidence as is now procurable leads Mr. Harding to the conclusion that both of these charges are without foundation. He is far from denying that there was political knavery enough and to spare among men of the revolutionary and constitutional period. There was selfish demagogy in abundance, shameless office seeking, gross personal abuse in the press, jockeying with the election laws, intimidation, and ballot-box stuffing. In many particulars, the unscrupulous politician of to-day has merely improved upon processes which were familiar to popular leaders of a century ago. Nevertheless, to all appearances, the actual bribery of the representatives of the people with money was not a sin which can be brought home to our fathers. Dawson's reference to "the son and biographer of one of the great leaders of the Constitutionalists in New York" seems to point to J. C. Hamilton, the son of Alexander Hamilton. In J. C. Hamilton's "Life" of his father, however, there seems to be no basis for such a charge as the one quoted. Mr. Harding deems it probable that the substance of Dawson's assertion—unless, indeed, he had in mind a personal communication—is merely a repetition of the charge contained in the earlier newspaper publications (in connection with which it is made), reënforced by a nebulous remembrance of some statement made in Hamilton's book which seemed to him to give color to the charge. This view is rendered the more probable by the fact that both charges referred the source of corruption to "a neighboring State," though, as we shall see presently, it was Rhode Island that was meant thereby in one case, while New York is expressly named in the other. It is scarcely conceivable that a second and independent stream of corruption should have existed, and yet have remained absolutely unnoticed by persons contemporary with the occurrences. Mr. Harding goes on to show that at the opening of the next session, after the publication of the bribery and corruption article above quoted, a demand was made in the Convention by Bowdoin and other Federalists for an investigation of the charges contained therein. Against the protests of Anti-Federalist leaders—protests which of themselves raised the presumption of falsity against the charge—a committee was appointed to inquire into the matter. In spite of the refusal of the printers to give the name of their informant, he ultimately proved to be one Col. William Donnison, who, in a card over his own signature, confessed that the only grounds he had for his assertion were, first, the statement of one citizen to another, which he had overheard, that a plan was "on foot to silence Mr. Nasson," and, secondly, another statement by "a credible person that he was told at Providence, about a week before, by a reputable gentleman there, that a bag of money had been sent down to Boston to quiet the members of the Convention [illegible] opposition to the new Constitution." After the publication of this charge, not even the most rabid Anti-Federalist ventured to repeat the charge. It was universally felt to be absolutely baseless.

Even after the adoption of the Constitution by the Convention, some traces of anti-Federalism are to be found in the action of the Massachusetts General Court, which assembled at Boston toward the close of February, 1788. Gov. Hancock, in his address, had not hesitated to give that praise to the new Federal system which, in the previous October, he had not deemed it "within the duties of his office" to accord; and of the Convention itself he says: "I believe there was never a body of men assembled with greater purity of intention or higher zeal for the public interest." This praise, both of the measure and of the men ratifying it, was echoed in the reply as originally framed, but Phanuel Bishop took exception to it and had the support of a majority of the members of the House. The matter was settled by a vote that the reply, as reported by the committees of the two houses, and as voted by the Senate should be referred to a committee instructed to report "such amendments thereto as that the said address, when passed, may not contain any opinion of the Legislature upon the merits of the Constitution." In one other way the Anti-Federalist sentiments of the Massachusetts House of Representatives were manifested. That body refused to sanction the publication of the address to the people in which the Convention had undertaken to answer the objections to the Federal Constitution, and, accordingly, the address was never published, though the manuscript of it has been preserved.

There is no doubt that the ratification of the proposed Federal Constitution by Massachusetts was the turning point in the contest, and consequently well deserves the exhaustive study which Mr. Harding has given it. Not only had that State influence enough to decide many States which before had been wavering, but she had, by her "conciliatory proposition," pointed out a way by which the Constitution might be saved, while, at the same time, would be obviated the dangers which, as many conceived, would result from unconditional acceptance.

M. W. H.

Teaching Sailors on Land.

NEW LONDON, Conn., Oct. 29.—Capt. Howard Fish of Groton, one of the oldest skippers in the New York yacht fleet, has returned from New York for the winter. He has considerable to say at the rooms of the Jibboom Club here concerning the merits of the new department of seamanship which the New York Nautical College is about to open and is soon to invite yachtsmen and sailormen all along the coast to inspect. New London yacht Captains are especially interested, for in this department it is expected many of the men who own the yachts which the New Londoners sail will be educated in the technical parts of a sailor's duties as well as in navigation. Capt. Fish reports that a unique and complete collection of large working models of vessels, ranging from the catboat to the square rig, a rigging loft, hand and steam power capstans, and all sorts of marine apparatus, have been provided by the college. Models of all the vessels were made by experts at Poillon's yard, two months having been devoted to the work. The masts of these craft are eight feet tall and of a size to afford training in handling all sorts of rigs. At present the members of the Jibboom Club, which is composed mainly of sea Captains, are debating the claim made for the college that a thorough curriculum of theoretical seamanship will be afforded by it on shore, in a warm room and on a level floor. Many of the Captains question that it is just as practicable to teach the handling of craft as well under such pleasant conditions as on the tumbling deck at sea, where salt and tar and strange oaths do abound.